

ITEMS

VOLUME 6 · NUMBER 3 · SEPTEMBER 1952
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

THE CONFERENCE ON SOVIET ECONOMIC GROWTH: CONDITIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

by Abram Bergson

THE subject of Russia's economic growth is of vital interest in this country. Social scientists are concerned with this theme not only because of the implications regarding Russia's military potential, but also because of their interest in the recurring question of the comparative economic efficiency of different social systems, and in the problems of industrializing backward areas.

The "Conference on Soviet Economic Growth: Conditions and Perspectives" was organized under the sponsorship of the joint Committee on Slavic Studies¹ with these several aspects in mind. It was hoped that the conference, which was held at Arden House, Harriman, New York, on May 23–25, 1952, would be of value both for the substantive information assembled on Soviet economic growth and as a basis for appraising needs for further research on this important topic.

Readers of *Items* do not have to be told that the study of the Soviet economy is still a youthful discipline in this country. The conference was the first of its kind in this field.

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE

In a brief report on the conference to fellow social scientists, it may be in order to say a word first about its organization. Of six sessions, the first five were

devoted to the delivery of main papers and comments by designated discussants and, where time permitted, by the participants generally. The final session was devoted to further informal discussion. All the main papers were circulated in advance in mimeographed form and the authors were asked to limit their oral presentations at the conference to summaries. Regrettably, even so there was less opportunity than had been hoped for extensive informal discussion. On the other hand, exchanges continued outside of conference hours. The participants were unanimous that such discussion, made possible by the sharing of a common residence at Arden House for the duration of the proceedings, was one of the more valuable features.

The conference numbered in all some thirty participants. The institutions represented included American University, University of California, University of Chicago, the Russian Institute at Columbia University, Cornell University, the Russian Research Center at Harvard University, Haverford College, Johns Hopkins University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford University, Syracuse University, the RAND Corporation, the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. In addition to the participants, the conference was attended by a number of observers from various government agencies.

All but two members of the conference were economists. The two exceptions were geographers. The writer knows he speaks for both groups in saying that the interchanges between the two disciplines represented were of distinct value. No doubt the discussion would have profited further if it had been possible

¹ The committee was appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council in 1948. The members of the committee are Merle Fainsod, Harvard University (chairman); Cyril E. Black, Princeton University (secretary); Abram Bergson, Columbia University; William B. Edgerton, Pennsylvania State College; H. H. Fisher, Stanford University; Waldemar Gurian, University of Notre Dame; Ernest J. Simmons, Columbia University; René Wellek, Yale University; Sergius Yakobson, Library of Congress.

to include also representatives from other areas, particularly industrial engineers familiar with Soviet technology.

As to the papers and discussion, space permits only a very limited sampling which may be suggestive of the general character of the proceedings.

NATIONAL INCOME AND PRODUCTION

While future prospects were the immediate concern, attention necessarily had to be given at various points to Soviet economic growth to date. Collating a variety of available calculations of Soviet national income, principally Naum Jasny's, Gregory Grossman concluded tentatively that this category may have increased at an average rate of about 6.5-7.0 percent per year during the prewar decade 1928-37, and again during the post-war years 1948-50. This is far below the growth shown by Soviet official statistics in 1926-27 ruble prices during the same prewar decade: 16 percent. The discrepancy is indicative of the upward bias that western students generally attribute to the official data due to methodological deficiencies, particularly the inflated values attached to new commodities introduced after the base year 1926-27. On the other hand, the calculated rate of growth of 6.5-7.0 percent compares favorably with that in other countries both in earlier and recent periods, and when compounded means nearly a doubling of income every ten years.

Referring only to industrial production, Donald Hodgman presented a novel independent calculation, involving the weighting of Soviet data on the production of individual commodities in physical units by the comparative wage bills in the corresponding industries. For the period from 1927-28 to 1937 the resulting average annual rate of growth is 15.7 percent. The corresponding figure indicated by Soviet official statistics in 1926-27 ruble prices is 18.6.

According to the writer, however, Hodgman's result, when taken together with Grossman's, is somewhat puzzling insofar as it implies a considerably smaller upward bias in the official statistics on industrial production than in those on national income as a whole. Actually, the problem of valuing new commodities has been especially important in the case of industry; for this reason the bias often has been thought to be greater for industrial production. Further inquiry on these growth rates seems indicated.

Another independent calculation was attempted by Walter Galenson concerning industrial labor productivity. There have been large differences under the five-year plans in the increase in productivity in different industries, and correspondingly there are large

differences as between industries in the level of labor productivity compared with the United States. But for a number of basic industries studied the rate of increase in Soviet productivity per man probably was significantly greater before the war than the average rate attained by American industry generally over the forty years 1899-1939: about 2 percent. On the average for industry generally, Soviet labor productivity may presently be about two fifths of that in this country. Joseph Berliner cautioned that a comparison of this sort may be affected by differences in the organization of industry. Thus, repair and maintenance work may be done mainly within the Soviet plant and outside the American plant, with the result that labor productivity is understated in the former in comparison with the latter. Also, the difference should be viewed in the light of the greater capital stock in the United States, and probably more intensive use of capital in the Soviet Union.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND ALLOCATION

In trying to appraise Russia's future economic growth, the participants generally proceeded by attempting to evaluate the past and likely future operation of different conditioning factors. On various accounts Evsey Domar felt that Norman Kaplan's thorough and detailed new calculations of capital investment may tend to underestimate this aspect. According to these calculations, the Russians in past peacetime years have invested about 15-20 percent of their gross national product in fixed capital. Surprisingly, this is no more than the United States generally has invested since the Civil War, except in depression years.

Kaplan also explored the question of Soviet policy on investment allocations. Under the prewar five-year plans, the Russians generally allocated about two fifths of their total investments to industry, while in the last two years the ratio has risen to about one half. For the United States the corresponding figure before World War I may have been about one fifth, and in the twenties and thirties about one quarter. Only for the war years 1941-45 does the allocation to industry in the United States compare with that in the U.S.S.R. in peacetime. The counterpart of relatively high allocations to industry in the U.S.S.R. is found chiefly in a relatively low allocation to such sectors as housing, although the investments here were greatly increased in the postwar reconstruction period and begin to approach the share of housing in American investment. Commenting on Kaplan's paper, Alexander Erlich observed that in trying to understand Russia's past and future growth, account has to be taken not only

of the volume of capital investment but also of a number of special aspects, particularly the high degree of capacity utilization, retention in use of superannuated equipment, and a probable emphasis on methods yielding quick returns.

Several participants considered that in the future investment might be a retarding factor in Soviet economic growth. Among other things, a continued expansion of military expenditures might limit investments in long-term industrial growth as well as allocations to consumption. Wassily Leontief pointed out, however, that declining investments do not necessarily mean a correspondingly declining rate of growth. In the light of American experience, there may be appreciable reductions in the course of time in capital requirements per unit of output. Alexander Gerschenkron commented that the prospect in the Soviet Union is for a continued high rate of allocations to defense and investment taken together. Given this and associated high output goals, Soviet economic growth may be expected still to be hampered as before the war by various handicaps, particularly the low inventories, "illicit activities" on the part of industrial management, inferior quality products, inflation, and over-centralization in planning.

INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES

According to Chauncy Harris, Soviet industrial resources generally are adequate to cover any likely industrial growth for the next decade or two, although supplies of some items, particularly lead, zinc, and bauxite, may have to be met increasingly through imports. On the other hand, the need to exploit resources of inferior quality and less accessible location will impose continually higher costs. Ninety percent of the energy resources are in the Asiatic part of the country, while most of the people live in the European part. Presently the equivalent of 30-40 percent of the total output of coal is needed as fuel for transportation. On this latter aspect James Blackman also made an illuminating calculation. Because of the vast space to be covered, the Russians presently may require about twice as much transportation per unit of production as the United States.

Concurring with this general view of the Soviet position in industrial resources, M. Gardner Clark elaborated difficulties facing the steel industry as a result of the increasing need to utilize low grade and less favorably located iron ore deposits. The shortage of good ore at Magnitogorsk already has been a matter of grave concern to the Soviet Union since World War II. Nicholas Rodin also anticipates significantly

rising costs in iron ore extraction, and in coal as well. On the other hand, Demitri Shimkin cautioned that considerable parts of the U.S.S.R. have yet to be adequately explored geologically; limitations of known and developed reserves may not apply equally to ultimate possibilities. Also, the heavy burden on Soviet railways is due partly not to space but to the heavy concentration in the U.S.S.R. on freight consuming solid as distinct from liquid fuels; but there is no indication that the recent Soviet trend toward solid fuels will be reversed in the visible future.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Referring to the question of agricultural resources, V. P. Timoshenko explained that the generally favorable impression of the Soviet position in this regard, based on the vastness of the land area, is erroneous. The Russians occupy one sixth of the earth's land surface, but because of climatic and soil limitations, they have been able to utilize for agricultural purposes only about one sixth of this land area. The expansion of this area in the future faces ever-growing difficulties. The ambitious plan for reforestation of the steppe announced in 1948 is mainly a long-run program and even if fully carried out (which is questionable) probably will have only limited effects on yields in the near future. To date plans to introduce new crop rotations with perennial grasses have met with only very limited success. Yields may be raised by increased use of fertilizer, but the large-scale use of fertilizers for grain would require much larger quantities than were produced before the war.

George B. Cressey concurred generally concerning the basic limitations of Soviet agricultural resources. In all probability the population of the Soviet Union can never be as well fed as the population of the United States.

Lazar Volin explored the prospects for different forms of agricultural organization including a continuation of the present trend toward heightened collectivization, liberalization, and peasant revolt. The effects of increased collectivism on agricultural production are conjectural.

POPULATION AND LABOR SUPPLY

Considering alternative possibilities concerning future Soviet mortality and natality, Warren Eason calculated that Russia's population, numbering some 200-205 millions in 1950, will increase to 253-283 millions by 1970. The population of prime working age (16-59 years) will increase from a present level of 121-123 millions to some 147-159 millions, or by an average

of about 1.5 millions a year. Frank Lorimer emphasized that Eason's projection utilized an ambiguous Soviet statement on population published immediately after the war. In any event, it seems more than doubtful that the Russians themselves would have known their actual population at that time with any precision.

According to Joseph Kershaw, an insufficient release of labor from agriculture may be an important limitation on future industrial growth. Presently there is substantial pressure on the limited arable land, with the cultivated area per farm person less than two fifths of that in this country. The need to expand this area and raise yields in order to feed a growing population may limit increases in labor productivity and the release of labor. The most likely prospect is a continued gradual reduction in the agricultural labor force. Assuming a constant food supply per head of the population, the farm labor force two decades hence might be only 5 millions below the present level.

Several of the participants commented further on this question of the adequacy of the labor supply for Russia's future growth. Eason's calculations show an average increment in the population of prime working age of 1.5 millions a year. This is about the same as the increment in the industrial labor force under the prewar plans. But industrial employment is now much larger than under those plans, and maintenance of anything like the percentage growth realized before the war would require, in addition to the calculated increment in the population of prime working age, a

continuing influx of workers from agriculture amounting to several millions a year. This seems ruled out by Kershaw's study. On the other hand, Russia still has a vast rural population and it appears rather paradoxical to envisage a labor shortage under these circumstances. Both Soviet and non-Soviet economists assumed a large "surplus" agrarian population on the eve of the five-year plans; it hardly seems possible that this "surplus" already has been fully absorbed.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Oleg Hoeffding, Harry Schwartz, Nicolas Spulber and others discussed Soviet foreign economic relations. Citing figures released by M. V. Nesterov at the World Economic Conference, Schwartz estimated that about three fourths of Russia's trade is presently with satellites and only about one fourth with Western and other countries. Given an unchanged international situation, the prospects are for a continued limitation of trade with the West, although the Russians no doubt would prefer some moderate level of exchange, involving appreciable imports of machinery, to the extremely low level now prevailing.

As is already more or less implied, it was not envisaged that the conference should attempt to reach any agreed conclusions and, in fact, no such attempt was made. A program listing the topics discussed and the speakers is appended. It is hoped that the proceedings will ultimately be published in full.

Program: CONFERENCE ON SOVIET ECONOMIC GROWTH

Arden House, Harriman, N. Y., May 23-25, 1952

ABRAM BERGSON, Columbia University, Chairman

Friday, May 23, Morning

NATIONAL INCOME AND PRODUCT

Paper: Gregory Grossman, Russian Research Center, Harvard University

Discussion: Alexander Gerschenkron, Harvard University
Wassily Leontief, Harvard University
Abram Bergson, Columbia University

CAPITAL FORMATION AND ALLOCATION

Paper: Norman Kaplan, RAND Corporation
Discussion: Alexander Erlich, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
Evsey D. Domar, Johns Hopkins University
Max F. Millikan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Afternoon

POPULATION AND LABOR FORCE

Paper: Warren Eason, RAND Corporation and Johns Hopkins University
Discussion: Frank Lorimer, American University

TRANSPORTATION

Paper: James Blackman, RAND Corporation and Johns Hopkins University

Discussion: Holland Hunter, Haverford College

Saturday, May 24, Morning

INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES

Paper: Chauncy Harris, University of Chicago

INDUSTRIAL LABOR PRODUCTIVITY

Paper: Walter Galenson, RAND Corporation and University of California, Berkeley

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Paper: Donald R. Hodgman, University of California, Berkeley

Discussion of the three papers:

Joseph S. Berliner, Russian Research Center, Harvard University
M. Gardner Clark, Cornell University
Nicholas W. Rodin, RAND Corporation
Dimitri B. Shimkin, Russian Research Center, Harvard University

Afternoon

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Paper: Vladimir P. Timoshenko, Stanford University

AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Paper: Lazar Volin, U.S. Department of Agriculture

AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT

Paper: Joseph A. Kershaw, RAND Corporation

Discussion of the three papers:

Edward Ames, Federal Reserve System
Leon M. Herman, U.S. Department of Commerce
George B. Cressey, Syracuse University

Sunday, May 25, Morning

ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH THE ORBIT

Paper: Oleg Hoeffding, Columbia University

EAST-WEST TRADE

Paper: Harry Schwartz, Syracuse University and *New York Times*

Discussion of the two papers:

Janet Chapman, RAND Corporation
Hans Heymann, Jr., RAND Corporation
Nicolas Spulber, New York City

Afternoon

General discussion of Soviet economic prospects

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON IDENTIFICATION OF TALENT, 1951-52

*by Members of the Committee **

APPOINTMENT by the Council of a Committee on Identification of Talent, in March 1951, was the outgrowth of expressions of interest by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation in the possibility of identifying in the first two decades of life the young people who will later be outstanding in various fields. It was recognized that the value of activities of foundations and organizations concerned with human resources might be increased if it were possible to make such identifications; and that, as recent studies have shown, many leaders, including prominent men in many walks of life, cannot be distinguished from the general run of college graduates by conventional intelligence tests.

These problems were considered by a conference held under the auspices of the Council in December 1950. The discussions at the conference were influential in the Council's decision to appoint the present committee to plan and promote research on variables related to the making of outstanding contributions to society. Two suggestions made at the conference have guided the work of the committee. First, although improvement in intelligence measures is desirable, it was suggested that because of their relatively advanced development and because of the many trained workers already devoting attention to this problem, a Council committee might better concern itself primarily with promoting greater understanding of nonintellectual factors, such as individual values and motives that may result in high achievement. The second suggestion was that this pro-

posed attack on the motivational and cultural aspects of achievement should be broadly conceived and designed to extend the base of such research by emphasizing primarily new modes of conceptualization and techniques of investigation, rather than concrete studies of talented persons.

Plans developed by individual members of the new committee, in line with these suggestions, were reviewed at its first meeting in May 1951, and recommendations for support of three projects were made in the event that funds for the purpose could be obtained. A grant of \$100,000 from the Markle Foundation to the Council in June 1951 provided for initiation of research on these projects.

At Wesleyan University research under the direction of David C. McClelland has centered on the relationship between achievement motivation and success in life. Since a measure of the strength of the achievement motive in individuals had already been developed, the primary problem was to find some objective measure of "success." A preliminary study has been conducted in a small community to determine what factors are correlated with success in the community as perceived by members of the community. This in turn leads to questions concerning the values that the community shares by which it judges a man successful, so that ultimately this project fits in with the project at Yale University on cultural determinants of achievement, discussed below. A paper on achievement status in a small town has been prepared in collaboration with John E. Kaltenbach, and another paper on the perception of achievement by undergraduates and its relation to achievement motivation is in preparation.

At Cornell University a study of social sensitivity is

* The members are David C. McClelland, Wesleyan University (chairman); Alfred L. Baldwin, University of Kansas; Uri Bronfenbrenner, Cornell University; Fred L. Strodtbeck, Yale University; Dael Wolfe, Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training. The present report was prepared for the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Council, September 8-11, 1952.

being carried on at the Department of Child Development and Family Relationships under the direction of Uriel Bronfenbrenner. It is concerned with identifying the skills and situational conditions that enable a person to sense how others in the social situation are thinking or feeling—a skill of recognized importance in human relations. Three important beginning steps in this research have been completed:

1. A critical survey of related scientific work to date has been prepared by Paul F. Dempsey and Doris M. Kells. The survey reveals several gaps in existing knowledge. First, practically no attempt has been made to study *spontaneous sensitivity*—the kind that occurs naturally in the social situation rather than in response to a specific question presented by the investigator. Second, sensitivity usually has been treated as if it were a single ability; the possibility that there may be several different kinds of sensitivity has been virtually overlooked. Third, very little attention has been paid to the role of the situation in facilitating or impeding sensitivity; it is possible that this skill may be enhanced by appropriate control of external factors.

2. A theoretical framework has been developed by Uriel Bronfenbrenner and Howard Shevrin, which permits dealing with the new types of problems outlined in the preceding paragraph.

3. A pilot study has been carried out, utilizing 40 college students, for the purpose of testing new ideas and methods. Results of the study indicate that it is possible to secure measures of spontaneous sensitivity, that it is likely that different types of sensitivity do exist, and that sensitivity may be increased or decreased by altering situational conditions. At the same time, the pilot study brought to light a number of technical problems which have to be solved before definitive findings can be obtained.

The staff of the Cornell project is now at work on an improved experimental design, based on experience in the pilot study, which it is hoped will permit further progress in identifying social sensitivity and its determinants. The experiments will be carried out during the late spring and summer and will be reported at the September meetings of the American Psychological Association in Washington, D.C.

At Yale University Fred L. Strodtbeck and Orville G. Brim, assisted by Florence Sultan, have worked on a diversified approach to cultural determinants of achievement in given social situations. In the introductory phases of their work Mr. Brim reviewed the

previous research on gifted children, Mrs. Sultan reviewed the research on the influence of values of adolescent peer groups, and Mr. Strodtbeck carried out methodological investigations of ranking methods and techniques of observing small groups. Arrangements have been made for publication of three of these papers.

As a service to the committee the Yale group has prepared a 3,000 item bibliography on achievement. The bibliography is composed of titles bearing upon the relation of cultural and personality factors to educational and occupational achievement, and covers the period from 1930 to date. Several additional sets of this bibliography, which is classified by topic, are available to interested research groups who may have need for a core bibliography in this area.

During the forthcoming months research by the Yale group will be extended beyond student populations to several cultural groups in New Haven. Attention will be given to attitudes relating to the selection of one family member for the type of training that must be supported by work of the family as a whole, and the typical resolutions of conflicts between family cohesiveness and the individual development and mobility associated with achievement. Further work to evaluate the use of attitude responses as a measure of the amount and nature of rational planning for achievement will also be carried out.

It is hoped that the results of these investigations together with additional materials bearing on achievement in other cultural groups can be brought together in a collection of papers devoted exclusively to cultural factors and achievement. In this connection, Richard D. Schwartz, who was associated with the Yale group in their early planning, has prepared an analysis of the comparative utilization of talent in decision making in a collective and individualistic settlement, based upon his field research in Israel. William Caudill is preparing a paper describing the cultural factors that are operative in the unusual achievement of Japanese Americans in urban situations.

In addition to conducting these research projects, which have been designed to break new ground in the study of talent, the committee has held several meetings at which other problems relevant to its general objectives have been discussed, usually with the assistance of an invited consultant. It is hoped that the work of the committee will stimulate further interest and research in a relatively unexplored area, which is of great importance to all groups interested in human resources.

SEMINAR ON SOURCE MATERIALS FOR THE MATHEMATICAL TRAINING OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

As a part of the Council's continuing interest in the improvement of training for research in the social sciences, particular attention has been given during the past two years to the mathematical prerequisites for research in social fields. Early in 1951 eight specialists were invited to prepare for the Council memoranda on the minimum mathematical background that might well be required of Ph.D. candidates in social anthropology, social psychology, and sociology. These memoranda, as summarized by Elbridge Sibley of the Council staff, showed a high degree of consensus as to topics that should be included in basic mathematics courses for students of these sciences, but many obstacles besetting the development and offering of such courses.

For some time these problems have been under discussion by a joint Committee on the Mathematical Training of Social Scientists, under the chairmanship of William G. Madow of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Illinois. This committee includes representatives of the American Anthropological Association, American Economic Association, American Educational Research Association, American Farm Economic Association, American Political Science Association, American Psychological Association, American Sociological Society, American Statistical Association, Econometric Society, Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Mathematical Association of America, and Psychometric Society. An informal inquiry from this group concerning the Council's interest in supporting a project concerned with improving the mathematical training of social scientists was considered by the Committee on Problems and Policy, with particular respect to what the Council might best do to advance sound quantitative training for students of social science. As a result Mr. Madow was invited to present a proposal for a summer seminar to be concerned with developing materials for teaching the mathematics needed for research

on social science problems. Production of a source book on mathematical methods for the social sciences would be the ultimate objective. Specific plans for work during the summer of 1952 by a group under Mr. Madow's direction, at Dartmouth College, were subsequently developed with the assistance of S. S. Wilks of Princeton University, and approved for support by the Council.

In addition to Mr. Madow, the members of the group which met from June 23 to August 23, were: Oswald H. Brownlee, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota; David A. Grant, Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin; George A. Miller and Robert Solow, Department of Economics and Social Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; E. William Noland, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina; Howard Raiffa, Department of Mathematical Statistics, Columbia University.

In the words of the director of the group, the problem and source materials to be prepared during the summer "were to be usable both by the mathematician who wishes to prepare courses to be taken by social scientists, and by the social scientist who wishes to see the mathematics that he should learn, and to have some help in learning it. The technique adopted is that of preparing sets of problems on single topics that begin at an elementary level and continue up to a point at which the results obtained are believed to be of direct interest to the social scientists in the area relating to the problem. Also, typical problems that apply to large numbers of social science areas are being abstracted and indications of the social science problems they include will be given. Finally, collateral materials, such as statements of the equivalents in mathematics of some social science phrases, of goals that a social scientist should try to attain, of possible course organizations, and of selected mathematical references, are to be included."

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS RESEARCH

William T. R. Fox (chairman), McGeorge Bundy, Gordon A. Craig, Harold Stein; staff, Bryce Wood.

As the result of growing interest in civil-military relations as a field of research, this committee was appointed in June for the purpose of defining areas for research, and encouraging and assisting social scientists who have undertaken research in this area. At its first meeting the com-

mittee stressed the need for promoting studies of the new civil-military relationships that have developed in recent years, in historical perspective. Arrangements were completed for bringing up to date the annotated bibliography on civil-military relations prepared and published for the Council's former Committee on Public Administration in 1940. As a second step the committee is canvassing persons believed to be interested in civil-military relations research, with a view to obtaining information about current schol-

arly activity. The committee is interested specifically in learning about relevant research projects currently under way, about studies that may be published in the near future, and about courses or seminars to be offered during the academic year 1952-53. Information of this sort or general comments on research of interest to the committee will be welcome. Communications should be addressed to Bryce Wood, staff of the committee, Social Science Research Council, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

The committee expects to maintain cooperative association with other groups interested in research in the same area.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADVANCED TRAINING (Appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils)

Charles E. Odegaard (chairman), M. H. Trytten (vice-chairman), Donald Bridgman, Aaron J. Brumbaugh, C. W. de Kiewiet, E. D. Grizzell, Quinn McNemar, Ralph A. Sawyer, Frederick F. Stephan, Paul Webbink, F. L. Wilkins, Jr., Malcolm M. Willey; Director, Dael Wolfe.

Funds have been provided by the Rockefeller Foundation for continuing the work of the Commission until the fall of 1954. The Commission's report on the inquiries conducted under its auspices during the past two years will be completed late this year. The Commission plans to continue some of the studies on which it has been engaged, and it will also undertake studies in two new areas. First, through analysis of occupational records of young people who have the intellectual ability for advanced training but have not obtained such training, an attempt will be made to see how effectively their talents are utilized.

The other new area is that of personality differences among people in different fields of specialization. Substantial information has already been obtained on the academic records, socioeconomic backgrounds, and aptitude test scores of persons who graduate from college or who enter graduate work in each of the major fields. But there is much overlapping among the different fields. It seems reasonable to expect that there are significant differences in interests, attitudes, and personality factors that distinguish scientists from business executives, social scientists from humanists, or engineers from educators. But it is by no means certain that useful information can be secured on just how the specialized groups do differ from each other. Personality tests are far from satisfactorily reliable and valid. Personality differences may be very large within a field, for the types of work in many fields are quite diverse and may appeal to equally diverse types of people. The Commission is aware of these difficulties and is entering this field with full knowledge that the results may be disappointingly small. Nevertheless, the Commission has decided that personality features should be investigated in the hope that the resulting data will add significantly to our knowledge of the characteristics of America's different groups of specialists.

One of the most satisfying aspects of the Commission's

work has been the opportunity to bring some coordination into the various efforts to study the nation's manpower resources and requirements. Too much of the work has been partial and segmental: the military services are primarily interested in military manpower; engineers are interested in the supply of engineers; there are much more generous fellowship programs in some of the specialized areas than in others. While these efforts may be good, they are only partial. It remains true that the next generation of specialists of all kinds will come from the present generation of students; policies intended for one group affect other groups as well; actions which affect the number of students enrolling in college influence the supply of people in all specialized areas. Consequently more useful information on supply and demand is likely to be secured if the problems are approached as a totality instead of being studied in a segmental fashion. The Commission has been free from the narrowing influences of having to concentrate on any particular group, and as a result has been able to study all types of specialists. In that program, and working cooperatively with many other agencies interested in manpower problems, the Commission has helped to bring about a broader and more inclusive approach to the study of the nation's intellectual resources and requirements.

D. W.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONS (Appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils)

M. H. Trytten (chairman), Marland P. Billings, Francis J. Brown, Aaron J. Brumbaugh, Harold C. Deutsch, Mortimer Graves, Herbert J. Herring, C. Phillip Miller, Sidney Painter, William R. Parker, C. F. Voegelin, Bryce Wood; staff, Francis A. Young, executive secretary; Trusten W. Russell; Elizabeth P. Lam.

The committee reviews the applications of American citizens in the category of university lecturer and advanced research scholar for assistance under the Fulbright Act; reviews the applications and assists in arranging institutional attachment for foreign nationals recommended by United States Educational Foundations or Commissions abroad for travel awards; and participates in related activities of program planning and publicity. The full committee meets five or six times a year; in the interim the functions of the group are carried on by the Washington members, one from each Council.

For American applicants, two major competitions are conducted each year: between March 1 and April 15, applications are accepted for Australia, Burma, India, New Zealand, the Philippines, and Thailand. Between June 1 and October 15, applications are received for Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg, Denmark, Egypt, France, Greece, Iraq, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom and Colonial Dependencies.

Agreements signed within the last year include those for Japan, Denmark, and Iraq. An interim competition for these countries for 1952-53 was conducted in the spring

of 1952. A very small program for the Union of South Africa will be initiated in 1953-54. The first agreement with Turkey will expire with the 1952-53 program; applications for Turkey for 1953-54 will be accepted by the committee on the tentative basis that they can be considered only if a new agreement is negotiated.

In 1951 nearly 2,000 applications were received for approximately 300 openings in 18 countries. The applications were first reviewed and rated by 44 committees in subject-matter fields, then by "country committees" which have the task of fitting the recommended candidates into the several country programs. The decisions of these two sets of committees were coordinated by the Committee on International Exchange of Persons in a general recommendation to the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which under the Fulbright Act makes the final appointments. Between the time of recommendation and selection, arrangements must be made for placement of candidates in institutions of higher learning abroad. The Foundations or Commissions abroad undertake this responsibility. The complicated nature of the selection process explains why so much time is required between the date an application is filed and the date the applicant is notified of the outcome.

It may be noted that approximately one third of all applications received are for the United Kingdom and another third are for France and Italy. This means that while there is a disproportionately large number of applicants in relation to the number of grants available in the United Kingdom, the number of applicants in relation to the number of awards offered for several other countries is not sufficient to create a really competitive situation. Thus a candidate might not be accommodated under the United Kingdom or certain of the other programs for Western Europe, even though his qualifications were judged superior to those of a candidate selected for another country.

The programs of awards which are publicized by the committee are drafted in the first instance by the Educational Foundations and Commissions in the participating countries and represent requests from institutions for professors in particular fields and lists of subjects in which research facilities are considered good. The programs are reviewed by the Department of State and the cooperating agencies and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, prior to publication.

In recommending candidates to the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the committee tries insofar as possible to meet the requests of foreign institutions, but an outstanding scholar in a field not specified in the country programs is often recommended in preference to a less well-qualified scholar in a designated field.

Because under almost all country programs there has been a history of unfilled requests from abroad, the committee has been asked by the Board of Foreign Scholarships to invite during the coming year a limited number of scholars of national and international reputation to participate as visiting lecturers on a noncompetitive basis. Such

invitations will supplement the usual selection of grantees from applications received in open competition. In general, invitations will be limited to specialists in certain fields in which the demand for lecturers by foreign institutions ordinarily exceeds the number of qualified persons making application, or in fields in which available specialists are extremely limited in number and not likely to be reached by means of general program announcements. While such invitations may be extended concurrently with the regular competition, they will be issued primarily in connection with openings that have proved difficult to fill in the past and will not supersede the open competition as the principal source of recommended candidates.

An announcement of the 1953-54 competition for Europe and the Near East (also Japan, Pakistan, and South Africa) appears on page 40 infra. The closing date for submitting applications is October 15, 1952.

In connection with the program for incoming scholars from abroad, it should be kept in mind that since Fulbright program funds are entirely in foreign currencies, awards to foreign scholars are limited to travel grants, and dollars for their support within the United States must be secured from other sources. Universities are encouraged to take the initiative in extending invitations to foreign scholars and in advising them to apply for travel grants through the United States Educational Foundations or Commissions in their own countries. In addition lists of foreign scholars available for lecturing may be secured from the Conference Board's committee. Such scholars have been endorsed by Foundations abroad, but institutional attachments and dollar support must be arranged before they can be selected for awards.

The Ford Foundation has recently granted the committee the sum of \$90,000 to provide maintenance awards or grants-in-aid for university professors from countries in the Near East and South Asia who qualify for travel grants under the Act. It is expected that the grant will enable approximately 30 professors to come to the United States for research and study during the academic year 1952-53. The committee is at present engaged in selecting recipients of the grants from candidates proposed from Burma, Egypt, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Turkey. Selection is based on leadership qualities of the candidates and on the importance of their proposed projects to the economic and social welfare of their countries and to the development of international understanding. Grantees recommended by the committee will be proposed to the Board of Foreign Scholarships and the Department of State for Fulbright travel awards.

E. A. H.

PSYCHIATRY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Alexander H. Leighton (chairman), Henry W. Brosin, John A. Clausen, Joseph W. Eaton, Herbert Goldhamer, Ernest M. Gruenberg, Clyde Kluckhohn, F. C. Redlich, Thomas A. C. Rennie.

At a meeting on April 1 the committee decided to begin a study of the problems, concepts, and methods now

employed in several current research projects that are exploring the relationship of social environment and psychiatric illness. This will be done through direct contact with the projects and also through investigation of relevant literature. It is hoped that a preliminary, comparative analysis will result and that it will point the way to more intensive studies. Edmund H. Volkart of Yale University and James S. Tyhurst, M.D., of Cornell University have agreed to serve as part-time staff members. It is expected that they will begin their work with the committee during the fall.

A. H. L.

SCALING THEORY AND METHODS

Harld Gulliksen (chairman), Paul Horst, John E. Karlin, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Henry Margenau, Frederick Mosteller, John Volkmann; staff, Warren S. Torgerson.

The organization and scope of the monograph on scaling theory and methods, which is being prepared by the staff of the committee, has presented continuing problems. Scaling methods in the past have been discussed in terms of experimental procedures, subject matter, stimulus characteristics, and type of response utilized—none of which seemed to be adequate. In addition, no clear-cut rationale for distinguishing between scaling methods and such related fields as test theory, factor analysis, psychophysics, analysis of variance, and bio-assay has been available. The organization finally adopted for the monograph is based on the theory underlying the different procedures, and distinguishes between three fundamentally different approaches to assigning numbers to events on the basis of experimental data. The *test theory approach* is directed primarily toward determining scale values of individuals, the items or stimuli being simply convenient means to this end. The *judgment approach* is directed primarily toward the *scaling of stimuli*, the individuals or judges being convenient means. The *response approach* attempts to determine simultaneously the scale values for individuals and the scale values for the stimuli. Of the three approaches, the monograph will be concerned only with the last two. The first, which lies within the province of psychological testing, has been covered adequately in a number of standard works in that field.

It is expected that first drafts of most of the chapters of the monograph will be completed by September 30, 1952.

w. s. t.

SLAVIC STUDIES

(Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies)

Merle Fainsod (chairman), Cyril E. Black (secretary), Abram Bergson, William B. Edgerton, H. H. Fisher, Walde-mar Gurian, Ernest J. Simmons, René Wellek, Sergius Yakobson.

During the past year the activities of the committee have extended into the following areas: supervision of publication of the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*; assistance in facilitating the procurement and distribution of research

materials in the Slavic field; sponsorship of the Conference on Soviet Economic Growth, on which a report appears on pages 29-33 supra; and establishment of priorities in development of the Slavic field.

Under the able editorship of Leo Gruliov and a small but devoted staff, the *Digest* has created an enviable place for itself among scholars, government officials, and publicists who are concerned with following current developments in the Soviet Union. The *Digest* is now in its fourth year and is supported partly by subscriptions and partly by a generous grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Subscriptions have increased steadily since the first year of publication, but rapidly rising costs over the same period have made it impossible to establish the *Digest* on a self-sustaining basis. While the future of the *Digest* appears assured for the next few years, it now seems probable that further outside support will continue to be essential beyond that period.

The committee continues to function as an organizing center to facilitate the flow of research materials to academic libraries interested in improving their Slavic collections. With the cooperation of the Library of Congress, some 13,500 volumes and 8,600 serials in its supply of duplicates have been distributed to 31 libraries. A substantial number still await distribution. The Library of Congress has also compiled a *Preliminary Checklist of Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian Newspapers Published Since January 1, 1917, Within the Present Boundaries of the U.S.S.R. and Preserved in United States Libraries*, and arrangements are in process to microfilm items in this list for sale to subscribing libraries. Its lists of Russian and East European Accessions provide an invaluable tool for scholars working in these areas. The Library of Congress is also preparing a new Union Subject catalogue in the Slavic field. The committee has worked closely with the Library in promoting these projects.

M. F.

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), Leon Festinger, Horace M. Miner, Robert R. Sears, Robin M. Williams, Jr.; staff, M. Brewster Smith.

The various activities and undertakings of the committee have been reported in the last three issues of *Items*. Since the last report the committee has sponsored a second conference on research in the field of social integration. Those attending the conference were Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Burton R. Fisher, Ward H. Goodenough, Werner S. Landecker, Horace M. Miner, Robert R. Sears, Leo Srole, Fred L. Strodtbeck, and Robin M. Williams, Jr., chairman. Substantial progress was made in giving some operational meaning to the concept of integration and in identifying specific and manageable areas of investigation that could profitably be structured with social integration as a focus of research interest and design.

The following potentially useful criteria of integration emerged from the discussion:

1. Capacity for concerted action of a given social unit or collectivity. This criterion subdivides into: (a) frequency of concerted activities, (b) number of different activities.
2. Consensus on the value of maintaining the unit or collectivity as such as shown by choice-behavior.
3. Mutual clarity of expectations; capacity of individuals to predict the behavior of others.
4. The individual's sense of his own identification with the group or collectivity.
5. For complex systems, the frequency and kind of communication between subgroups within the larger system. Alternatively, the degree of self-sufficiency of subgroups; this can be partially indexed by the frequency of participation in common activities.

It was thought that the following fields might provide areas for research wherein social integration could be systematically analyzed and generalizations regarding it developed: the phenomena of *anomie*; the modes of adaptation to contrary demands occasioned by the simultaneous occupation by the individual of different statuses calling for different responses to a given situation; the amount and intensity of communication within various social systems in relation to the degree of integration; the relation

of value consensus and clarity and congruence of mutual expectations characterizing specified groups, such as the family, as a measure of capacity to act in concert and maintain the group.

The conference planned to continue its explorations of the field in a joint meeting in August with the Council's interuniversity summer research seminar on social integration in Ann Arbor, after which recommendations as to desirable and feasible next steps would be made to the committee.

In the meantime plans are being made by Leon Festinger for a second working conference early in the fall to consider research possibilities in the area of communication and interpersonal processes. Also in process is the first draft of a manual on cross-cultural studies of socialization, copies of which will be distributed to participants in the working conferences on socialization and to others with special interest in this field for criticisms and suggestions.

Following the working conference on communication and interpersonal influence the committee will meet to appraise the results of the past year's work and to plan its program for 1953.

L. S. C.

PERSONNEL

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING

One additional area research training fellowship and one additional travel grant for area research have been accepted since the announcement in the June *Items* of awards made at the April meeting of the committee in charge of this program—Fred Eggan (chairman), Cyril E. Black, W. Rex Crawford, Cora Du Bois, Richard Hartshorne, and Robert S. Smith. The new appointments are:

Charles B. McLane, Ph.D. candidate in public law and government, Columbia University, a fellowship for research in the United States on policies and attitudes of the Soviet government toward the Chinese Communist party, 1935–49.

George W. Hoffman, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of Texas, a travel grant for research on the changing economic geography of Austria.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

The joint Committee on Southern Asia, appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council, has been constituted as follows for the year 1952–53: W. Norman Brown, University of Pennsylvania (chairman); Horace I. Poleman, Library of Congress (secretary); Kingsley Davis, Columbia University; Stephen W. Reed, Yale University; Lauriston Sharp, Cornell University. Karl Pelzer of Yale and George McT. Kahin of Cornell are serving pro tem for Messrs. Reed and Sharp, respectively.

A Subcommittee on Socialization, of the Committee on Social Behavior, has been appointed for the year 1952–53 with the following membership: Robert R. Sears, Harvard University (chairman); Alfred L. Baldwin, University of Kansas; Carson McGuire, University of Texas; John W. M. Whiting, Harvard University.

PUBLICATIONS

SSRC BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pp. Cloth, \$3.00.

Support for Independent Scholarship and Research by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pp. \$1.25.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pp. \$1.50.
Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00.
Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.
Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pp. \$1.25.

The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman, with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pp. Paper, \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.

PAMPHLETS

Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pp. 50 cents.

Area Studies in American Universities by Wendell C. Bennett. 1951. 92 pp. \$1.00.

Domestic Control of Atomic Energy, Pamphlet 8, by Robert A. Dahl and Ralph S. Brown, Jr. 1951. 122 pp. \$1.00.

DIRECTORY OF FELLOWS

Fellows of the Social Science Research Council 1925-1951. New York, 1951. 485 pp. Limited distribution. \$5.00.

All publications listed are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

Announcements of fellowships and grants to be offered by the Council in 1953 are scheduled for distribution about October 1, 1952. Research Training Fellowships, Area Research Training Fellowships, Travel Grants for Area Research, Grants-in-Aid of Research, and Faculty Research Fellowships will be offered on substantially the same basis as in recent years. Beginning with the current year, however, fellowship committees will meet only once annually, in the spring.

The deadline for all applications has been advanced to January 5, 1953, in the hope that it may be possible to inform applicants of committee decisions by the first of April. Prospective candidates for fellowships are especially urged to communicate with the Council early in the autumn, so that the staff can arrange to interview as many as possible before the late winter and early spring, when the pressure of business reaches its peak.

Inquiries should be directed to the Washington office of the Social Science Research Council, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

FULBRIGHT PROGRAM

Applications for United States Government grants for the academic year 1953-54 for university lecturing and post-doctoral research under the Fulbright Act will be accepted until October 15, 1952 for Austria, Belgium and Luxembourg, Denmark, Egypt, France, Greece, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Turkey, the United Kingdom and Colonial Dependencies, and the Union of South Africa.

Nearly 300 awards, approximately half of them for lecturing and half for research, are offered under the present competition. This figure includes grants in all fields, but the social sciences are well represented among the subjects designated by foreign institutions as those in which visiting scholars would be particularly welcomed.

Requests for application forms and for detailed information regarding specific opportunities in the countries listed above should be addressed to the Executive Secretary, Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D.C.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1952: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, RAY A. BILLINGTON, GORDON A. CRAIG, J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FRED EGGAN, CHARLES FAIRMAN, ROBERT B. HALL, PENDLETON HERRING, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNIS, OTTO KLINEBERG, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS McGREGOR, LOWRY NELSON, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, DON K. PRICE, THEODORE W. SCHULTZ, ROBERT R. SEARS, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, HOLBROOK WORKING, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, President; PAUL WEBBINK, Vice-President; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, Executive Associate; HAROLD E. JONES, Pacific Coast Representative; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, Financial Secretary